

REMARKS

The Final Office Action of October 23, 2008, has been carefully reviewed, and in view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the above Office Action the Examiner objected to the title, specification, and drawings. As set forth above, the title has been amended to be more descriptive and a corrected drawing sheet is attached. Newly added Figures 5 and 6 are also being submitted to assist in clarifying the invention as described in the specification. The specification has been amended consistent with the drawing revisions.

In addition, claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-18 and 20-23 were rejected under Section 112, first paragraph (?), as failing to comply with the written description requirement and under Section 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner noted that there was no description for the "apparatus" moving from a first position to a second position or for an aperture surrounded by a guide wall. With respect to the moving of the apparatus, the claims have been amended to more correctly recite the relative movement between the base member and the cradle member. With respect to the aperture and the guide wall, the Examiner's attention is directed to the paragraph beginning on Page 5, line 26 of the original specification, and as amended above to further clarify the recited features.

In view of the above amendments, Applicant respectfully contends the rejections under Section 112 have been obviated.

In addition to the above, claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Helot et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,264,488).

With regard to the rejections over Helot, claim 1 recites that "the alignment means comprises an aperture in the cradle member at least partly surrounded by a guide wall such that in use the electrical contactor assembly is guided by the wall when the base member is moved relative to the cradle member from the first position to the second position." In view of the clarifying amendments made above, Applicant contends that these features are clearly disclosed and should not be ignored.

Applicant respectfully submits that Helot does not disclose or suggest alignment means that includes a guide wall surrounding an aperture, which guide wall guides the contactor assembly when the base member is moved relative to the cradle member the first to the second position. More specifically, in Helot, it can be seen that the contactor assembly is not directly guided but rather, the docking station relies on the placement of the laptop 10 in alignment with the alignment members 26, 32 and hooking members 52 to try and ensure that it mates with the terminal on the laptop.

The direct guiding of the contactor assembly of the present invention, as recited in claim 1, results in a more accurate guiding into contact with the terminal and furthermore enables the contactor assembly to move in a linear axial direction with respect to the terminal, rather than the arcuate movement disclosed in Helot. Thus, the claimed arrangement results in reduced wear on the contactor assembly and the terminal which can thereby increase their service life.

Moreover, Helot is concerned with a standard docking station for use in an office environment and the ease of use of such a device. The present invention is concerned with a docking device for use in vehicles in which security and durability are the prime concerns (see page 1, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4). Thus, the cited

reference to Helot does not recognize the problem solved by claim 1 of the present application of providing more accurate guiding and therefore a more durable connection and does not, therefore, include a teaching, suggestion or motivation to arrive at the solution claimed.

With reference to independent claim 18, Helot does not disclose a docking apparatus that is closed when in the second position and in which, unless the computer is fully received in the cradle, the cradle is prevented from being moved to the second position. Specifically, in Helot the cradle member 40 is open and may be pushed down whether or not the laptop 10 is correctly located on it or not. This risks damage being caused to the connector assembly and/or the terminal. As such, said problem is also not recognised by Helot, nor is there any suggestion of a solution thereto. Applicant thus contends that claim 18 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the present application are now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is earnestly solicited.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned counsel for Application regarding the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: January 23, 2009

By: /Wendi L. Weinstein/
Wendi L. Weinstein
Registration No. 34456

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620